

Remarks

Applicants note with appreciation that that the Examiner has identified Claims 3-11, 16, 22-23, 26-34, 43 and 46 as being directed to allowable subject matter. Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claims 15-16 and 43 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 14, 17, 22-24, 26, 39 and 46 have been amended. Claims 47-58 have been added to recite further limitations of the claimed invention. Pending claims 1-14, 17-42 and 44-58 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

Section 112 Rejections:

Claims 14 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 14 and 42 are believed allowable based on the above amendments and the following discussion.

The Examiner asserts that Claim 14 is indefinite because “no limit” to the queue is a physical impossibility. Applicant amends Claim 14 to recite that there is no limit, subject to physical limitations of the queue. It will be understood that having no limit allows a user to fill the queue until there is no more space left. If the queue is a linked list in a system with a large amount of memory or storage, where the system allows dynamic memory or space allocation to the queue, then the queue may be filled to all of the available space in the memory or storage. Given the vast amount of data that may be stored, the queue is *virtually* limitless. This type of limit, in practice, will be seen by those of skill in the art as unlimited, in practice.

The Examiner asserts that Claim 42 is not possible because it requires the second computer to access the web page through itself. The Examiner misunderstands the recited Claims. Claim 39 requires that the first computer accesses the web page through the gatekeeper, but that the gatekeeper accesses the requested URL. Further, a thumbnail of the web page is displayed on the second computer. This display enables an operator to approve or disapprove of the URL for the first computer. The gatekeeper does not act independently, unless the URL is in

an approved list, as described in the specification. The gatekeeper and the display may reside on the same computer. In the context of Claim 42, the gatekeeper is a module or process running on the second computer. It will be understood by those of skill in the art that the second computer will display the web page thumbnail for an operator on the second computer, but that the first computer cannot access the URL until the gatekeeper process on the second computer authorizes its access to the first computer. There is no prohibition against these operations taking place on the same physical computer. The second computer displays the web page because the gatekeeper can access the web page over the network. Denial of access to the URL is only applicable to the first computer. The second computer accesses the URL via the gatekeeper which retrieves the web page over a network, then it is displayed, also on the second computer for explicit approval or denial by an operator.

Section 102 Rejections:

Claims 1, 2, 12-15, 17-21, 24, 25, 35-42, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. (hereinafter “Bellinson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 1, 2, 12-15, 17-21, 24, 25, 35-42, 44 and 45 are believed allowable based on the above amendments and the foregoing and following discussion.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 16. Claim 2 is now dependent on an allowable base claim. Claim 12-14 and 17-21 are now dependent on an allowable base claim. Claim 24 is amended to include the limitations as found in allowable Claim 16. Claims 25, 35-38 now depend on an allowable base claim. Claim 39 is amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 43. Claims 44-45 now depend on an allowable base claim.

Further, Applicant asserts that the Examiner is mistaken in the rejection of Claim 13. The Examiner asserts that a limited queue is inherent because buffers/memory have inherent storage limits. However, the Examiner fails to understand the recited limitation. Claim 13 requires that the queue is limited to a maximum predetermined number of allowed URLs in the queue. Thus, a parent or operator may choose to limit the user/child's queue request to five, ten, or some other finite number of queue requests, for instance, so the parent is not overwhelmed with requests. This predetermined limit has nothing to do with the physical limitations of buffer

or storage size. Thus, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and Claim 13 is allowable.

As for Claim 20, the Examiner asserts that failure to view a web page is the same as sending a message to the first computer indicating denial of the URL request, if the URL request is denied. This is contrary to Applicant's claim. A denial message is a specific message indicating to the child/user that the URL is denied. If the child/user requests a web page and the parent or operator of the second computer is not available, this request will be queued. The web page may fail to display on the first computer, but possibly, only temporarily. Once the operator approves the page, the child/user may view it. However, once the URL is denied, the child/user will receive a notification of denial, so the child/user knows that retrying the URL later will be futile. This notification is not the same as just a temporary failure to display the page.

As for Claims 21 and 45, the Examiner asserts that Bellinson teaches that a third computer may be used to approve/deny access to URLs when the operator of the second computer is unavailable. The Examiner asserts that a distributed network will have a third computer. However, just having another computer on the network does not result in Applicant's claimed invention. The Examiner fails to note the requirements of operators on the second and third computer. Distributing processes among computers on the network, as described by Bellinson, and will be understood and known in the art, generally, does not teach or show that the operator of the second computer is a parent/guardian and the operator of the third computer is a trusted friend or family member. Claims 21 and 45 require that the third computer is to be used with a trusted friend or family member only when the parent/guardian is unavailable at the second computer. There is no recitation of the availability of the hardware, as would be solved with a distributed computing system. In contrast, Applicant's claim requires the interaction of a specific type of operator. Bellinson teaches only the automatic approval or denial of the URL based on an approved list, or rating service. No human interaction, as described and claimed by Applicant, is suggested.

Claims 47-58 are added to recite further limitations of the claimed invention. These claims differ from the cited art, at least, because Bellinson fails to teach or suggest that the operator of the second computer interacts with the second computer to respond to a request for the URL. If the URL is not automatically approved, based on an approved list, the operator will

view a portion of the web page associated with the URL, typically a thumbnail of the web page, before granting approval. Bellinson fail to teach or suggest the dynamic interaction of a person in the approval stage. Thus, Claims 47-58 should be permitted to issue along with the other allowable Claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-14, 17-42 and 44-58 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 20-Dec-2007

/ Joni D. Stutman-Horn /
Joni D. Stutman-Horn, Reg. No. 42,173
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(703) 633-6845

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402